

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 7, 11-13, 20, 21, 47, 48, 83, 84, 137, 139, 155, 157, 161, 162, 165-168, and 189, and canceled claims 10, 85, 130, 132, 136, 138, 156, 160, 169, and 170. Claims 57-82, 86-95, 107-129, 134-135, and 140-141 were canceled previously. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 11-56, 83, 84, 96-106, 131, 133, 137, 139, 142-155, 157-159, 161-168, 171-189 are currently pending, and favorable reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Previous Office Action**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful examination of the application and for the allowance of claims 96-104, 142-154 and 185-188 in the previous Office action.

Applicant also wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of patentable subject matter in claims 3, 6, 10-11, 13, 26-29, 31, 35-37, 42-45, 130-133, 136-139, 156-159, 161-162, 165-170, 175, and 181-184.

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 14-25, 30, 32-34, 38-41, 46-56, 83-85, 105-106, 155, 160-165, 167-174, 176-180 and 189 in the previous Office action, but respectfully submits that the present amendments have addressed all of the Examiner's concerns.

### **Claim Objections**

The Examiner has objected to claims 3, 6, 10-11, 13, 26-29, 31, 35-37, 42-45, 130-133, 136-139, 156-159, 161-162, 165-170, 175, and 181-184 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 3, 6, 10-11, 13, 26-29, 31, 35-37, 42-45, 130, and 131 all depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 130, which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and Applicant has canceled claim 130. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

submits that claim 1 as amended is allowable, and that the remaining dependent claims referred to by the Examiner are allowable due to their dependency directly or indirectly from claim 1, and also due to the additional subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Claims 132 and 133 depend directly from independent claim 47. Applicant has amended claim 47 to include the subject matter of claim 132, which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and Applicant has canceled claim 132. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 47 as amended is allowable, and that claim 133 is allowable due to its dependency from claim 47, and also due to the additional subject matter that this claim recites.

Claims 136 and 137 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 83. Applicant has amended claim 83 to include the subject matter of claim 136, which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and Applicant has canceled claim 136. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 83 as amended is allowable, and that claim 137 is allowable due to its dependency from claim 83, and also due to the additional subject matter that this claim recites.

Claims 138 and 139 depend indirectly from independent claim 84. Applicant has amended claim 84 to include subject matter from claim 138, which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and Applicant has canceled claim 138. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 84 as amended is allowable, and that claim 139 is allowable due to its dependency from claim 84, and also due to the additional subject matter that this claim recites.

Claims 156-159, 161-162, 165-170, 175, and 181-184 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 155. Applicant has amended claim 155 to include subject matter from claim 156, which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and Applicant has canceled claim 156. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 155 as amended is allowable, and that the remaining dependent claims identified by the Examiner are allowable due to their dependency directly or indirectly from claim 155, and also due to the additional subject matter that these claims recite.

The Examiner has objected to claim 166 and has recommended that amendments be made to the claim language. Applicant has amended claim 166 to clarify the claim language and make the claim more readable. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's concerns about the clarity of claim 166 have been addressed.

The Examiner has advised that if claims 160, 161, and 162 were allowable, then claims 164, 169, and 170 would be objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75 as being duplicates. Applicant has canceled claims 160, 169, and 170, and thus respectfully submits that the problem referred to by the Examiner has been eliminated, therefore the Examiner's provisional objection under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75 has been overcome.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the Examiner's objections have been overcome.

### **35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 as being indefinite, alleging that two phrases of claim 7 contradict one another. Applicant has amended claim 7 to remove one of the passages that the Examiner has considered contradictory. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 7 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and therefore the Examiner's rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 has been overcome.

The Examiner has rejected claims 161, 162, 165, and 167-170 as being indefinite because the phrase "completion candidates" was allegedly ambiguous. Applicant has amended claims 161-162, 165, and 167-168 to clarify the meaning of the phrase "completion candidates", and Applicant has canceled claims 169-170. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 has been overcome.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 12, 14-24, 30, 32-34, 38-41, 46-56, 83-85, 105-106, 155, 160, 163-164, 171-174, 176-180 and 189 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Masui (US 5,959,629).

Claims 1, 47, 83, 84, 155

As described above, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 47, 83, 84 and 155 to include subject matter which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable if presented in the form of an independent claim. In view of the aforesaid amendments made to independent claims 1, 47, 83, 84 and 155, Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejections of these claims under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Masui (US 5,959,629) have been overcome.

Claims 85 and 160

Claims 85 and 160 have been canceled.

Claims 2, 4-5, 7-9, 12, 14-24, 30, 32-34, 38-41, 46, and 105

Claims 2, 4-5, 7-9, 12, 14-24, 30, 32-34, 38-41, 46, and 105 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable due to their dependency from claim 1, and also due to the additional subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Claims 48-56 and 106

Claims 48-56 and 106 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 47. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable due to their dependency from claim 47, and also due to the additional subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Claims 163-164, 171-174, and 176-180

Claims 163, 164, 171-174, and 176-180 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 155. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable due to their dependency from claim 155, and also due to the additional subject matter that each of these claims recite.

Claim 189

Applicant has amended claim 189 to include a limitation similar to the limitation that has been added to independent claim 155. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 189 is allowable for reasons including those provided above in respect of claim 155.

**35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masui in view of “PalmOS”. Claim 25 depends directly on amended claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is allowable due to its dependency from claim 1, and also due to the additional subject matter that it recites.

**Other Amendments**

The Abstract has been amended to reduce its length to fewer than 150 words, as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b).

The Brief Description of the Drawings section has been amended to include a reference to Figure 6A, which is included in the Drawings and referenced in the Detailed Description section.

Claims 2, 6 and 11-13 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and have been amended to reflect the amendment to claim 1.

Claim 48 depends directly from independent claim 47, and has been amended to reflect the amendment to claim 47.

Claim 137 has been amended to depend directly from claim 83, because it previously depended on now-canceled claim 136.

Claim 139 has been amended to depend directly from claim 84, because it previously depended on now-canceled claim 138.

Claim 157 has been amended to depend directly from claim 155, because it previously depended on now-canceled claim 156.

**Summary of Office Actions Recently  
Received in Related U.S. Cases**

Applicant wishes to advise the Examiner that Applicant has received an Office Action dated 06-07-2007 for U.S. Application No. 11/133,770, a divisional of the present application, in which Examiner Blackwell:

1. rejected certain claims relying upon the reference(s) identified in Table A1 below; and
2. cited, but did not rely upon, the references identified in Table A2.

Table A1

Document No. Country Code-Number- Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
U.S. 5,959,629	09-1999	Masui	345/347

Table A2

Document No. Country Code-Number- Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
US 3,644,898	02-1972	Post, Paul B.	715/534
US 4,330,845	05-1982	Damerau, Frederick J.	715/507
US 4,471,459	09-1984	Dickinson <i>et al.</i>	715/533
US 4,648,044	03-1987	Hardy <i>et al.</i>	706/60
US 4,689,768	08-1987	Heard <i>et al.</i>	715/533
US 4,786,765	11-1988	Yamanami <i>et al.</i>	178/19.06
US 4,783,761	11-1988	Gray <i>et al.</i>	715/533
US 4,847,766	07-1989	McRae <i>et al.</i>	715/532
US 4,980,855	12-1990	Kojima, Yasumichi	715/533
US 5,261,112	11-1993	Futatsugi <i>et al.</i>	715/533
US 5,392,447	02-1995	Schlack <i>et al.</i>	715/863
US 5,594,640	01-1997	Capps <i>et al.</i>	715/532
US 5,657,397	08-1997	Bokser, Mindy R.	382/225
US 5,821,512	10-1998	O'Hagan <i>et al.</i>	235/383
US 5,835,635	11-1998	Nozaki <i>et al.</i>	382/226
US 5,845,300	12-1998	Comer <i>et al.</i>	715/508
US 5,963,666	10-1999	Fujisaki <i>et al.</i>	382/187
US 5,974,558	10-1999	Cortopassi <i>et al.</i>	713/323
US 5,982,351	11-1999	White <i>et al.</i>	715/810
US 5,977,948	11-1999	Nishibori, Masahiro	715/841

Document No. Country Code-Number- Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
US 6,026,233	02-2000	Shulman <i>et al.</i>	717/113
US 6,037,942	03-2000	Millington, Jeffrey Alan	715/835
US 6,167,412	12-2000	Simons, Tad Decatur	708/105
US 6,167,411	12-2000	Narayanaswamy, Shankar	715/541
2001/0000962	05-2001	Rajan, Ganesh	345/302
2001/0027468	10-2001	Okura, Hirotsugu	709/202
US 6,405,060	06-2002	Schroeder <i>et al.</i>	455/566
US 6,442,295	08-2002	Navoni <i>et al.</i>	382/229
US 6,621,939	09-2003	Negishi <i>et al.</i>	382/291
US 6,751,603	06-2004	Bauer <i>et al.</i>	707/1
US 6,888,141	05-2005	Carr, William N.	250/338.1
US 6,934,906	08-2005	Cheok, Lai-tee	715/500.1
2005/0198144	09-2005	Kraenzel <i>et al.</i>	709/206
US 6,970,513	11-2005	Puri <i>et al.</i>	375/240.25
US 7,003,446	02-2006	Trower <i>et al.</i>	704/9
US 7,224,409	05-2007	Chin <i>et al.</i>	348/32

Applicant also wishes to advise the Examiner that Applicant has received an Office Action dated 05-18-2007 for U.S. Application No. 11/134,759, a divisional of the present application, in which Examiner Jenkins:

1. rejected certain claims relying upon the reference(s) identified in Table B1 below; and
2. cited, but did not rely upon, the references identified in Table B2.

Table B1

Darragh *et al.*, "The Reactive Keyboard: A Predictive Typing Aid" IEEE Computer 23, 11 (November 1990), 41-49

Masui, T. 1998, "An Efficient Text Input Method for Pen-based Computers," 04/18-23/1998, In Proc. SIGCHI Conf. On Human Factors in Computing Systems (LC. Karat, A. Lund, J. Coutaz, and J. Karat, Eds. Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. ACM, pp. 328-335

Document No. Country Code-Number- Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
U.S. 5,347,295	09-1994	Agulnick <i>et al.</i>	345/156

Table B2

Baeza-Yates, *et al.*, "A New Approach to Text Searching." Communications of the ACM 35, 10 (October 1992), 74-82.

Bellman *et al.*, "A Probabilistic Character Layout Strategy for Mobile Text Entry." Department of Computer Science and Department of Computing and Information Science, University of Guelph. Guelph, Ontario, Canada. 1999

Bohan *et al.*, "A Psychophysical Comparison of Two Stylus-Driven Soft Keyboards." Department of Psychology, Wichita State University. Wichita, Kansas. 1998.

Venolia *et al.*, "T-Cube: A Fast, Self-Disclosing Pen-Based Alphabet." In Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '93) (April 1993), Addison-Wesley. pp. 265-270

Wu *et al.*, "AGREP – A Fast Approximate Pattern-Matching Tool." Department of Computer Science, University of Arizona. Tucson, Arizona. In Proceedings of USENIX Technical Conference (San Francisco, CA) (January 1992), pp. 153-162

Applicant wishes to advise the Examiner that Applicant received an Office Action dated 10-18-2006 for U.S. Application No. 10/399,560 in which Examiner Watt:

1. rejected certain claims relying upon the reference(s) identified in Table C1 below; and
2. cited, but did not rely upon, the references identified in Table C2.

Table C1

Document No. Country Code-Number- Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
U.S. 5,818,437	10-1998	Grover <i>et al.</i>	715/811
U.S. 5,574,482	11-1996	Niemeier	345/173
U.S. 5,864,340	01-1999	Bertram <i>et al.</i>	715/780



Appl. No. 09/631,101  
Amdt. dated July 23, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of June 4, 2007

PATENT

Table C2

Document No. Country Code-Number- Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
U.S. 6,801,1907	10-2004	Robinson <i>et al.</i>	345/173

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Should the Examiner have any further concerns, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Examiner's earliest convenience so that the Examiner's concerns can be addressed as expeditiously as possible.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Applicant respectfully notes that while the present amendments have been made to expedite issuance of a patent based on the present application, Applicant does not thereby intend to abandon any of the subject matter of the previous versions of the claims but expressly reserves the right to pursue this subject matter in one or more continuing applications.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:m6s  
61097792 v1